What New Asian Doctrine? Pps. 2-3

The True Meaning of Nixon's "Vietnamization" Policy

"What I was told and what I saw there persuaded me that 'Vietnamization' is in fact a canopy being hoisted to shelter—perhaps to conceal—our staying in, not getting out . . . I found no prominent American or South Vietnamese, who thought the present government of South Vietnam would be able to maintain itself even in two or three years if our armed support were withdrawn."

—Rep. Allard Lowenstein at a press conference Sept. 24 back from Saigon to launch a campaign with ADA, SANE and ENOUGH for immediate withdrawal.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL XVII, NO. 18 OCTOBER 6, 1969 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Immediate Withdrawal Becoming A Bandwagon

Whom the gods would destroy, they first drive inane. At press conference last week it was hard to distinguish Nixon from Agnew. He implied that to criticize his slowdown in Southern school desegregation—15 years after the Brown decision—was to ask for "instant integration"! He could see no ethical problem in replacing Fortas, the judicial moonlighter, with Haynsworth, the judiciary's most absent-minded stock speculator. He said there were no American combat troops in Laos, except maybe in certain activities he did not care to discuss. He denied there was any numbers game in picturing the cancellation of 50,000 draft calls for November and December as a sign of approaching peace in Vietnam, although from June to October he had drafted 56,000 *more* men than last year and four days earlier the Pentagon had announced as an economy move that it would be taking 70,300 *fewer* men into the armed services. He rejoiced that at the UN he had found "no significant criticism" of U.S. policy in Vietnam; the Secret Service must have rushed him through the delegates' lounge pretty fast. He is against the Goodell bill to remove all U.S. troops from Vietnam by Dec. 1, 1970 because he wants to get them out sooner, but it is better not to let the enemy know because that would destroy his incentive to negotiate. All we need to bring peace he said is a "united front" at home. The united front hasn't been advocated so openly since the 1937 convention of the Communist party. As for the student moratorium of Oct. 15 and the other anti-war demonstrations planned for this fall, Nixon said "under no circumstances" would he "be affected whatever." Before making that remark, he should have phoned that man down on the ranch.

Even That College in South Dakota

Either the wiretaps at 1029 Vermont Avenue have broken down or Nixon hasn't caught up with the transcripts. That has suddenly become the busiest place in Washington. On the tumultuous eighth floor, with 17 telephones and 11 outside lines, veterans of the McCarthy movement led by David Hawk and Sam Brown, are swamped by the response to the Vietnam moratorium, a campus study-stoppage for peace on Oct. 15. On the floor above the more politically unkempt but equally vigorous New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam is having trouble coping with public response to its Nov. 15 "March Against Death" to Washington and its "No Peace for Nixon" drive, aimed to make his public appearances uncomfortable until all U.S. troops are out of Vietnam. The best index of the response is that even the bucolic state college in South Dakota where Nixon last June 3 could safely attack student dissent has defected; the names of the Vietnam dead will be read there on Oct. 15 and a "tree of life" planted.

When Howard Zinn in *The Nation* a few years ago first proposed immediate and unconditional withdrawal, he was a political leper. Now this is becoming a bandwagon. When Congressman Allard K. Lowenstein, the founding father of the dump Johnson movement, called a press conference last week to demand immediate withdrawal, he was flanked by spokesmen for organizations as sedately respectable as ADA and SANE. The next day Senator Goodell, once solidly right-of-center, called a press conference to launch S 3000, to cut off all funds for U.S. military personnel of any kind in Vietnam after Dec. 1, 1970. Goodell named it "the Vietnam Disengagement Act." It is his bold move to build a peace and left-of-center constituency for re-election in the face of Republican New York Old Guard unwillingness

(Continued on Page Four)

The No. 1 Road-Block To Peace

The war will not end as long as the people who are now in power in Saigon are able to dominate our policy.

—Walter Lippman to the AP on his 80th birthday

High government officials, recently returned from Hanoi, are mildly optimistic about the possibilities of a political settlement—if the U.S. makes enough concessions. The leaders in Hanoi, these officials say, are resigned to the prospect of a separate and non-Communist South Vietnam for at least the next decade . . . Nor will they hold out for a political settlement that would guarantee their control of the country in a short space of time. The Indian observers . . . were given assurances, they say, that a real slackening in the pace of fighting, accompanied by serious American troop withdrawals, would be matched by a de-escalation on the Communist side. Indian officials, however, are convinced that there can be no negotiated end to the war as long as the present regime in Saigon stays in power.

—Crosby Noyes from New Delhi: Wash. Star, Sept. 25

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The China Menace Is America's Most Costly Hallucination . . .

Carefully examined, there is no new Nixon doctrine for Asia. Nixon is still, as he was in the 50s, an Asia Firster. In Senator Mansfield's report (Sept. 22) on the trip he made to Southeast Asia at Nixon's request *(Perspective on Asia: The New U.S. Doctrine and Southeast Asia),* Mansfield was surprised to find no "sign of a follow-through to the new doctrine . . . Some U. S. missions still expect this Nation to continue as a major military factor in Southeast Asia after the conclusion of the war in Vietnam . . . In short there is no indication, as yet, of when or how the size of the U.S. presence in Asia is to be reduced in any significant degree."

The Budget's Biggest Rathole

The Mansfield report throws fresh light on the magnitude of our involvement. It says that in addition to 500,000 troops in Vietnam and 50,000 in Thailand, we have "in the general area and at least partially connected with our involvement in Southeast Asia" 40,000 men in Japan, 45,000 in Okinawa, 10,000 in Taiwan, 60,000 in the Seventh Fleet, 30,000 in the Philippines and additional thousands of Guam— "in all a figure approaching 800,000." If we apply the rule of thumb that it costs about $10,000 a year to maintain a soldier abroad that is $8 billion a year. This understates the financial commitments because it omits the bases, and the aid we give out to pay for the bases. We only have about 55,000 men in Korea, for example, but the cost of our Korean involvement is about $1 billion a year. Asia is the budget's biggest rathole.

Senator Mansfield is a humane man. He is always hoping that he can coax, flatter and educate the White House into saner policies by acting as courtier and counsellor rather than critic. This was his approach to Johnson and now to Nixon. He is pretending that on Guam Nixon really enunciated a new policy and he is hoping that the pretense can be made a reality. But all Nixon really expressed on Guam is that same hope which led Dulles to form SEATO, the hope that somehow we could build a ring of hostile states around China on the cheap, with these peripheral Asian regimes supplying the manpower while we supplied arms and aid. This is where Vietnam began.

A new policy has to be clear and forceful to be implemented. If it is announced, as Nixon did, in a "not-for-direct-quotation" press conference, it must remain fuzzy. There is no official record of what he said—surely a curious way to launch a new policy. The nearest thing to a full paraphrase was published in the *New York Times* July 26. Here one may find the real sources of Nixon's unwillingness to be pinned down on just what his new policy is. It rests on two old delusions.

The first is in Nixon's notion of how to avoid new Vietnams. As the *Times* account put it, "he (the President) is convinced that the way to avoid becoming involved in another war in Asia is for the United States to continue to play a significant role" in Asia. You get out by staying in. The second lies in his view that the main danger to world peace is in China. Three times he stressed its "growing power", "its very aggressive . . . and belligerent attitude."

Mansfield's most important discovery was that "there was little expression of fear in any of the countries visited of

The Imperial Shadow Is Not China But Ours

". . . the independence of Asian countries would be hollow indeed if it involved merely an exchange of a past colonial status for the indefinite prop of U.S. support . . . we have acted on the scale we have in Southeast Asia largely to support small nations against what has been calculated as the threat of Communist aggression—notably from China. In fact, there was little expression of fear in any of the countries visited of an attack or invasion from China. . . . It seems to me that our presumption of a primary danger to the Southeast Asian countries, which they themselves do not perceive, does not provide a sound basis for U.S. policy. Rather, it tends to create for this Nation the role of selfappointed, great power protector in an area in which a militant young nationalism speaks the common language of resistance to foreign intrusian . . . The age in which foreign military dominance of any Asian people was a practical possibility has long since ended."

—Senator Mansfield's report on the Southeast Asian tour he made at Nixon's request.

Hartke Marshals 23 Votes Against A $25 Billion Naval Boondoggle

The Senate voted last week to begin production of the Navy's F-14 "fighter," which Sen. Hartke calculates will cost at least $25 billion by 1980. Actually, Hartke said, it is not a fighter at all but a slimmed-down, more costly version of the Navy TFX missile aircraft. It looks like one of the great aerospace boondoggles of all time, dwarfing the TFX and the C-5A, and maybe even the Safeguard ABM. The Navy estimates the F-14 program will amount to 1,200 aircraft at a cost of nearly $10 million each. Operating costs will double this price over ten years.

Hartke uncovered a lot of Pentagon documents backing his case that the F-14 is a bad aircraft. But the papers all had security classifications which prevented him from putting them into the Congressional Record. He found that Navy pilots denounce the new plane as too clumsy and slow, and that the Pentagon's Office of Systems Analysis has shown how a better fighter can be built for one-third the cost. That would mean abandoning the heavy Phoenix missile, which the Navy says is required to shoot down Soviet bombers. But last year the Senate Preparadness Investigating Subcommittee found the Soviet bomber threat to our fleet almost nonexistent. Hartke uncovered the fact that the Phoenix will cost $400,000 apiece. There will be six to an aircraft. Outfitting the new Navy fighters with it will cost anywhere from $2 billion to $10 billion additional.

Hartke's amendment to require the Senate Armed Services Committee to take a new look at the F-14 was killed on a 63 to 23 vote. Sen. Cannon scornfully said his Tactical Airpower Subcommittee had already studied the aircraft. None of the Senators fighting military spending rose to the occasion when Cannon then confessed that he had not see any of the critical studies of the F-14 listed by Hartke in the Sept. 5 Congressional Record. But Cannon's admission highlighted, as much as anything in the debate on the defense budget, what a shallow examination the Armed Services Committees give most major Pentagon requests.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . China's Entire GNP Does Not Equal the Pentagon's Budget

an attack or invasion from China." He added softly, "It seems to me that our presumption of a primary danger to the Southeast Asia countries, which they themselves do not perceive, does not provide a sound basis for U.S. policy."

The China menace painted by Nixon at Guam is the old bogey of China Firsters like Knowland in the 50s. It is useful to turn from the Mansfield report to the latest annual survey of the world military balance published by the Institute for Strategic Studies in London which has just arrived here. There are, first of all, two ways to estimate the Gross National Product of China. In terms of the yuan it has been figured at $48 billion and in terms of equivalent dollar purchasing power at $78 billion. Either way, China's entire production of goods and services, civilian and military, does not equal the $80 billion a year we spend on the military alone.

Not Really A Great Power

China has space and manpower; it may easily be defeated but it is almost impossible to occupy and conquer. It is an optical illusion to consider it a great power in any other sense. Even in the number of men under arms, it ranks third (with 2.8 million) after the U.S. (3.4 million) and the Soviet Union (3.3 million.) We have almost 9 percent of our manpower under arms, China has less than 2 percent.

China cannot supply a bigger army. Though there are 150 million Chinese of military age, the Institute says the Chinese arms industry "could not supply more than a small part of this manpower with modern weapons, even small arms." It "would be in no position to produce weapons on a scale needed for war" and it adds, "neither could Chinese-produced nuclear arms be a substitute for them." The latest official U.S. estimates claim we can deliver 4200 atomic warheads and the Russians 1200. The Chinese, the Institute reports, may have "stocks of fissile material" which "might be sufficient" for about 100 atomic bombs of the Hiroshima "baby" size and perhaps a few large megaton fission-fusion bombs. Even this may be overestimating China's capacity since "the lengthening gap" between China's nuclear tests *may mean that fissile material "is not being produced in the* quantities originally forecast in the West."

Atom bombs cannot be sent by parcel post. China is even weaker in means of delivery. A chart in the Institute report shows the delivery capacity of the five nuclear powers in five categories: land-based ICBMs, sea-based missiles, long range bombers, medium range missiles and bombers, and medium bombers. All China has are "a few" medium bombers, copies of our old B-29s. Its missile program is lagging. There are no signs of preparations "for deploying medium range missiles" nor of preparations for the oceanic testing ICBMs require.

Several times in the past decade China offered us an "atom free Pacific" pact. Some day we may be sorry we did not accept. Now this pitifully small atomic program is the excuse for a huge deployment of American nuclear power in the Pacific, the atomic umbrella Nixon promised at Guam to maintain. Until we dissipate the China bogey, and give up the idea of playing policeman and nursemaid to the shrewd but corrupt oligarchies on China's borders, we will have more Vietnams and maybe worse. America's only course of safety and sanity is to get out of Asia altogether. Nixon wants to stay in.

How The Pentagon Shuts Out The Watchdog

General Accounting Office has told Congress that it cannot fulfill an assignment to scrutinize and report continuously on the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile (ABM) program because the Defense Department has blocked access to key documents. According to Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats, GAO is being permitted to see only final documents approved by Lt. Gen. Alfred D. Starbird, the system manager. "We are precluded from seeing . . . (hiatus in original) any documents at variance with a final decision," Staats said. Staats testified before the Senate Government Operations executive reorganization subcommittee, headed by Sen. Ribicoff (D. Conn). The subcommittee is considering expansion of GAO and an increase in its investigative power.

—Aviation Week & Space Technology, September 22

Putting The Spotlight on The Biggest Obstacle to Tax Reform In The Senate

Nixon's reversal of his Treasury Secretary on oil depletion allowances is in character. Less obvious an obstacle to this and other tax reforms is the Senate Finance Committee. Johnson and Kerr packed it long ago with Senators on whom they could count to vote for oil depletion and other tax loopholes for the upper brackets. A survey by Congressional Quarterly which few papers will print shows this is where pressure has to be brought if there is to be tax reform. Of the 17 members a majority has voted for depletion allowances. Only three members voted against them in 1964 the last time a vote was taken. They were Ribicoff (D. Conn), Gore (D. Tenn) and Williams (R. Del).

Among the liberals on the Committee who have voted for oil depletion allowances—and other tax favors for the rich—are Fulbright (D. Ark), Hartke (D. Ind), McCarthy (D. Minn). Another liberal member, Harris (D. Okla), has sponsored tax reform but opposes any reduction in oil depletion allowances. A Fulbright aide told CQ's Les Gapay that this year Fulbright was considering Proxmire's proposal for a graduated depletion schedule, cutting the allowance for big producers. Ribicoff has introduced a sweeping tax reform bill despite the power of insurance and aircraft companies in Connecticut.

McCarthy and Hartke, among the liberals on the Committee, have the worst records for sponsoring special interest tax legislation. A Wall Street securities firm, Brimberg & Company, provided the largest single source of lecture funds for Senators last year, with McCarthy ($5,000) and Hartke ($2,500) getting the largest fees.

The chairman of the Finance committee, Russell Long, son of Huey, likes to pose as a Populist but is a pillar of the oil and gas industry. Other members are wealthy men with business interests their tax votes protect. Among them are Jordan (R Idaho), Fannin (R. Ariz), Anderson (D.N.M.), Byrd (D. Va.), Talmadge (D. Ga), and Bennett (R. Utah). Miller (R. Iowa) is a former tax lawyer. Curtis (R. Neb) is another lawyer who opposes tax reform. Hansen (R. Wyo) the newest member, is for depletion allowances. The greatest friend on the committee for those seeking tax favors was Dirksen, perhaps the biggest phony ever to sit in the U.S. Senate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There May Be A Moratorium In Congress, Too, On October 15

(Continued from Page One)

even to renominate him. The bill brought an anguished cry from Rockefeller, who appointed Goodell to the Senate last year and wishes he hadn't. The Goodell bill gives the peace movement a focus and a target date. It also raises the ante for former Justice Goldberg, Goodell's most probable opponent, who will have to be explicit to match S.3000.

Strange Parliamentary Maneuver

Morse and Gruening would hardly recognize the Senate these days. Four Senators, Goodell, Hatfield, McCarthy and McGovern, have already endorsed the Oct. 15 Moratorium. Senator Harris, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, met with 11 other Senators and 12 Congressmen to extend the moratorium into the halls of Congress. There is talk of a movement to stay away that day and deny both houses a quorum. Senator Fulbright has promised hearings on the Goodell bill; these should provide a continuous anti-war forum. The most striking evidence of the rising rebellion came when Senator Cooper offered an amendment to the $20 billion military authorization bill to forbid any funds for U.S. combat troops in Laos or Thailand. This threw the Pentagon into a dither. Normally the bill would easily have been voted down but Stennis was so afraid of a vote he decided to sweet-talk it instead. He said he approved its purpose but sought to de-fang the bill by interpreting it as applicable only to funds available in the $2.5 billion military aid bill. He then voted for it, precipitating unanimous approval, 86 to 0. This was the first time in history that the leadership could only block a measure by marshalling a unanimous vote *for* it, albeit trickily reinterpreted. But the maneuver, even if effective, leaves the door wide open to a less ambiguous amendment when the military appropriation bill reaches the Senate.

Look What Thieu Wants Now

Mr. SCALI: If the U.S. leaves behind Air Force units, artillery and logistics support, do you think that by the end of 1970 your ground forces would be able to withstand whatever enemy pressure remains?

President THIEU: No. 1970 is not enough . . .

Mr. SCALI: Do you expect that President Nixon will announce a third withdrawal of American troops some time after December 15?

President THIEU: We have agreed that at any time we would like to replace more U.S. troops, we have to discuss it together. President Nixon has not yet told me about the next for 1970, and we are waiting for a new plan for that.

Mr. SCALI: The President has not given you even a tentative timetable . . .?

President THIEU: No, not yet, up to now . . . The problem is not to stick (sic) and run but to help this small country to grow up and to be strong . . . so that the U.S. can be free and stay behind and help us economically and in more sophisticated weapons, like atomic warfare that we have not.

Mr. REYNOLDS: More sophisticated weapons like what?

President THIEU: Like atomic weapons.

—ABC's Issues and Answers, Sept. 28.

OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION

(Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code)

1. Date of Filing Sept. 21, 1969.
2. Title of Publication: I. F. Stone's Weekly.
3. Frequency of issue: Every other week; not published in August.
4. Location of known office of publication: 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20008.
5. Location of the headquarters or general business offices of the publishers: 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20008.
6. Names and addresses of publisher, editor, and managing editor: I. F. Stone, same address.
7. Owner *(if owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given):* I. F. Stone, 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20008; Esther M. Stone, same address.
8. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities (If there are none, so state): none.
9. Paragraphs 7 and 8 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bonafide owner.

	Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceeding 12 months	Single Issue Nearest To Filing Date
A. Total No. Copies Printed	47,500	52,000
B. Paid Circulation		
1. Sales Through Agents, News Dealers or Otherwise	2,984	3,102
2. To Term Subscribers by Mail, Carriers Delivery, or by other means	43,760	47,996
C. Total Paid Circulation	46,744	51,098
D. Free Distribution (including samples) by Mail, Carrier Delivery, or by Other Means	200	300
E. Total No. of Copies Distributed	46,944	51,398
F. Office Use, Etc.	506	602
G. Total	47,500	52,000

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete. I. F. Stone, editor.

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 10/6/69

4420 29th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED